



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,180	03/27/2001	Michail Petropoulos	ENSY-002	3827

23686 7590 04/09/2003

Dan Hubert & Associates
3111 Camino Del Rio North
4th floor
San Diego, CA 92108

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,180

Applicant(s)

PETROPOULOS ET AL.

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application filed on 03/27/01 in which claims 1-38 are presented for examination.

1. *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement filed on 03/27/01 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Because it has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

2. *Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. Example at page 2, line 22, it contains an embedded hyperlink. Correction is required.

3. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 18-22, 26-32 and 35-38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern (U.S 5970490) in view of Goodwin et al. (U.S 6199195) (Goodwin).**

Regarding claims 1, 10, 11, 18-22, 26-32 and 35-38, Morgenstern discloses: A method for constructing a query system for use with a body of data, comprising operations of:

Art Unit: 2171

providing a data schema (22, 24, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Morgenstern) describing entries in a body of data such that the entries provide instances of the data schema (col. 33, lines 19-49, Morgenstern);

providing multiple appearance templates each providing instructions for computer presentation of on-screen constructs to receive user input of query parameters (col. 33, lines 1-18, Morgenstern);

providing multiple control schemas (32, 52, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Morgenstern) each control schema prescribing constituent components of query form controls (54, 34, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Morgenstern) providing instances of that control schema, the prescribed components of each control schema comprising: specification of at least one appearance template and at least one subquery generator ;

mapping between the specified appearance template (col. 33, lines 50 to col. 34, lines 19, Morgenstern) and the data schema between the specified subquery generator and the data schema (col. 32, lines 58-65, Morgenstern) ;

providing one or more query form schemas (fig. 5 and corresponding text, Morgenstern) prescribing constituent components of corresponding query form annotations that provide instances of the query form schemas (col. 31, lines 42 to col. 32, lines 42, Morgenstern), said components comprising: identification of one or more of instances of the control schemas (fig. 3 and corresponding text, Morgenstern); identification of elements of the data schema to be presented in query results (col. 22, lines 41 to col. 23, lines 8, Morgenstern).

However, Morgenstern didn't disclose: providing multiple subquery generators each comprising machine-executable code to prepare machine-executable query instructions applying

Art Unit: 2171

a predetermined logical operation to the body of data. On the other hand, Goodwin disclose: providing multiple subquery generators (710, 712, 714, 716, fig. 7, and corresponding text, Goodwin) each comprising machine-executable code to prepare machine-executable query instructions applying a predetermined logical operation to the body of data (fig. 4 and corresponding text, Goodwin). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the multiple subquery generators as claimed in the system of Morgenstern as taught by Goodwin. The motivation being to enable the user to generate query statements and create the desired controls.

In addition, Morgenstern/Goodwin disclose: a compiler to create web browser compatible representations of the query form annotation (col. 25, lines 15-56, Morgenstern);

A run-time engine comprising an assembler to construct queries against the data schema according to query parameters submitted by user completion of the web-browser compatible representations (col. 6, lines 64 to col. 7, lines 7, Goodwin) and a rendering engine to provide web browser compatible output of query results (col. 7, lines 8-62, Goodwin). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include A run-time engine comprising an assembler to construct queries and a rendering engine to provide web browser compatible output of query results as claimed in the system of Morgenstern as taught by Goodwin. The motivation being to enable the user to submit the request and receive the complex results at run time and tailored by a developer.

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Morgenstern/Goodwin disclose: wherein the control schemas are separate from the query form schemas.

5. Claims 3, 4, 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenstern (U.S 5970490) in view of Goodwin et al. (U.S 6199195) (Goodwin) and further in view of Katz et al. (U.S 5404295) (Katz).

Regarding claims 3 and 12, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 11 above, respectively. In addition, Morgenstern/Goodwin disclose: further comprising operations of developing the query system, comprising: constructing one or more controls, each control comprising an instance of one of the control schemas (col. 31, lines 63 to col. 32, lines 3, Morgenstern);

However, Morgenstern/Goodwin didn't disclose: constructing one or more query form annotations, each annotation comprising an instance of one of the query form schemas. On the other hand, Katz disclose: constructing one or more query form annotations, each annotation comprising an instance of one of the query form schemas (col. 5, lines 61 to col. 6, lines 14, Katz). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include constructing query form annotations as claimed in the combination system of Morgenstern/Goodwin as taught by Katz. The motivation being to enable the users have the option to select and design the query form.

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 4 and 23, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3 and 22 above, respectively. In addition, Morgenstern/Goodwin/Katz disclose: wherein the control schemas are integrated into the query form schemas (col. 11, lines 24,-39, Morgenstern), and the operations of constructing the query form annotations includes the operation of constructing the controls (col. 6, lines 49-62, Katz).

6. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-9, 13-17, 24, 25, 33 and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record and that encountered while searching for the claimed invention fails to anticipate and/or suggest: a method and system for constructing a query system for use with a body of data comprising operations of compiling the query form annotation, comprising for each query form annotation in association with the constructed query form web page, initializing the subquery generators specified by the controls identified by said query form annotation as recited in claims 5, 13, 24, and 33.

Regarding claims 6-9, 14-17, 25 and 34, these claims depend from claims 5, 13, 24 and 33 respectively and are therefore allowable.

7. Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2171

Ramanathan et al. (U.S 6182136). Automated service elements discovery using core service specific discovery templates.

Rauer et al. (U.S 6161103). Method and apparatus for creating aggregates for use in a datamart.

Blinn et al. (U.S 6484150). Electronic shopping and merchandising system accessing legacy data in a database independent schema manner.

8. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CN

Cindy Nguyen
April 2, 2003


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100